

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on February 3, 2011 which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application, where claims 1, 10 and 11 are independent.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice. Further, the specification has been amended to correct a certain informality.

By means of the present amendment, the claims have been amended for non-statutory reasons, such as for better form including beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', and deleting reference designations typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Such amendments to the claims were not made in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,808,792 (Woodgate) in view of U.S. Patent 6,888,540 (Allen). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claims 1-11 are patentable over Woodgate and Allen

for at least the following reasons.

Woodgate is directed to an observer tracking display in which image data, displayed by at least three image displays along respective different directions, is updated depending on the lateral position of an observer. FIG. 3 schematically shows the generation of a three view, three lobe display by a single spatial light modulator and a lenticular array 22. The three lobes are labeled -1, 0, 1, and each lobe comprises three images A', B', C'. Further FIG 4 shows the output of a multi-lobe three window display, while FIG 5 shows the output of a multi-lobe four window display. The windows are labeled 1, 2, 3, 4, and each window displays either left view data or right view data. Positions A to G in FIG 4 show the lateral position of an observer.

It is respectfully submitted that Woodgate does not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 10 and 11 which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

optical means for displaying multiple viewing cones, a first cone of the multiple viewing cones comprises different views so that a different view is observed by a right eye and a left eye of a viewer of the multiview display device, the different views of the first cone having an angular distribution relative to the display device; and...

the angular distribution has a first part of adjacent views with **increasing** viewing angle and a second part of **adjacent views with decreasing** viewing angle.

A cone with different views having an angular distribution with **both adjacent increasing and adjacent decreasing** viewing angles is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Woodgate. It is alleged in the sentence spanning page 2-3 of the Office Action that "as


shown in Fig. 3 the convergence point B' would be the increase viewing angle and the edge points of A' and C' would be the decreased viewing angles." This allegation is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that the three images A', B', C' in the three lobes -1, 0, 1 of FIG 3 of Woodgate have nothing to do with any increasing and decreasing viewing angles. Even assuming, arguendo, that somehow this allegation is true, the alleged edge points of A' and C' that allegedly show decreased viewing angles are NOT adjacent. By contract, independent claims 1, 10 and 11 specifically recite that the angular distribution has "a second part of adjacent views with decreasing viewing angle." Allen is cited to allegedly show other features and does not remedy the deficiencies in Woodgate.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, and 10 and 11 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-9 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claim 1 as well as their individually patentable elements. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
April 6, 2011

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP

111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101

Please direct all inquiries and correspondence to:

Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
(914) 333-9643